



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/617,732 07/17/00 CUMMINGS

W JWB-2000-5-P

┌

QM12/0117

└

EXAMINER

PATTERSON, M

JAMES W BADIE
STOLL MISKIN HOFFMAN & BADIE
EMPIRE STATE BUILDING SUITE 6110
350 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10118

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

#2

DATE MAILED: 01/17/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/617,732

Applicant(s)

Cummings et al

Examiner

Marie Patterson

Group Art Unit

3728



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3208

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no basis in the original specification for the specific thickness range of 1/8 inch - 3/16 inch for the taper of the forefoot member as claimed in claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 the phrase "lateral wedge member is confusing, vague, and indefinite because it is not clear what disclosed structure applicant is referring to. Especially since in claim 7 applicant further claims a tapered bottom sole member.

Claim 6 appears to duplicate claim 4 from which it depends rendering is confusing as to what further structural limitations applicant intends to encompass with such language.

Art Unit: 3208

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Blissett (5448839).

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Talarico, II (4620376).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noone (4866861) in view of Lyne (2179942).

Noone shows a shoe with a forefoot lateral wedge (20) and a heel counter (figure 3) with a lateral heel stabilizer (62) substantially as claimed except for tapering the forefoot lateral wedge.

Art Unit: 3208

Lyne teaches tapering a protruding wedge (see figure 6). It would have been obvious to taper the wedge of Noone as taught by Lyne to provide a smooth transition between the sole and the wedge.

8. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blissett in view of Noone.

Blissett shows a shoe with a tapered forefoot member and a tapered heel wedge (see column 3 line 35- column 4 line 6) substantially as claimed except for a forefoot lateral wedge and a lateral heel stabilizer. Noone teaches providing a forefoot lateral wedge (20) and a heel stabilizer (62). It would have been obvious to provide a forefoot lateral wedge and a lateral heel stabilizer as taught by Noone in the shoe of Blissett to make the shoe able to assist a wearer when playing golf.

In reference to claims 2 and 7, Blissett as modified above discloses the claimed invention except for the exact ranges of thicknesses as claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the forefoot wedge $1/8$ - $1/4$ inch thick or $1/8$ - $3/16$ inch, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

9. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of applications or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without

Art Unit: 3208


contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148 or the Tech Center 3700 **Customer Service Center** number is **(703)306-5648**.

For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 305-3580. Please identify Examiner ____ of Art Unit ____ at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries concerning the merits of the examination should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0069.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Valerie Douglas at (703)308-1337.

Check out our web-site at "www.uspto.gov" for fees and other useful information.


Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

MDP

January 11, 2001

ATTACHMENT TO AND MODIFICATION OF
NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY (PTO-37)
(November, 2000)

NO EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE PERMITTED TO FILE CORRECTED OR FORMAL DRAWINGS, OR A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION, notwithstanding any indication to the contrary in the attached Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).

If the following language appears on the attached Notice of Allowability, the portion lined through below is of no force and effect and is to be ignored¹:

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE to comply with the requirements noted below is set to EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE "DATE MAILED" of this Office action. Failure to comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. ~~Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).~~

Similar language appearing in any attachments to the Notice of Allowability, such as in an Examiner's Amendment/Comment or in a Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948, is also to be ignored.

¹ The language which is crossed out is contrary to amended 37 CFR 1.85(c) and 1.136. See "Changes to Implement the Patent Business Goals", 65 Fed. Reg. 54603, 54629, 54641, 54670, 54674 (September 8, 2000), 1238 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 77, 99, 110, 135, 139 (September 19, 2000).